

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

**U.S. Department of Homeland Security**  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services**

B5

DATE:

**MAY 03 2011**

OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

PETITION:

Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

  
Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will summarily dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner seeks classification under section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2), as an alien of exceptional ability in the arts, sciences or business. The petitioner seeks employment as a dog trainer. The petitioner asserts that an exemption from the requirement of a job offer, and thus of a labor certification, is in the national interest of the United States. The director found that the petitioner does not qualify for classification as an alien of exceptional ability in the arts, sciences or business, and that the petitioner has not established that an exemption from the requirement of a job offer would be in the national interest of the United States.

The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part, “[a]n officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.”

On the Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, filed on March 29, 2010, counsel indicated that a brief would be forthcoming within thirty days. To date, over a year later, careful review of the record reveals no subsequent submission; all other documentation in the record predates the issuance of the notice of decision. Therefore, counsel’s statement on Form I-290B constitutes the entire appeal.

On the Form I-290B, counsel stated that the petitioner qualifies for the national interest waiver because “the petition contains clear evidence of [the petitioner’s] exceptional ability in the field of dog training.” Counsel repeatedly states that the petitioner has established exceptional ability, but counsel offers no arguments to support this conclusion. Similarly, counsel states the conclusion, with no supporting argument, that the beneficiary’s ability to train dogs for security personnel qualifies him for the national interest waiver of the job offer requirement.

Conclusory statements with no supporting arguments do not provide a sufficient basis for a substantive appeal. Because counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the appeal must be summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.